

Appl. No. 09/608,705  
Arndt dated 10/9/03  
Reply to Final Office Action of 7/29/03

Remarks

The Office Action mailed July 29, 2003 has been received and the Examiner's comments carefully reviewed. Prior to entry of this paper, Claims 1-23 were pending. Claims 1-6, 8-10, and 13-23 were rejected. Claims 7, 11 and 12 were objected to. In this paper, new claims 24-28 are added, Claims 7, 10, 11, 17, and 18 are cancelled, and Claims 1, 8, 12, 19 and 23 are amended. Claims 1-6, 8, 9, 12-16, and 19-28 are currently pending. No new subject matter has been added. For at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-6, 8-9, 13, 14, 16-19, and 21-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Sampson* (United States Patent No. 6,490,624). Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sampson* in view of *Aguilar* (United States Patent No. 6,430,687). Claims 15 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sampson* in view of *Gerdisch* (United States Patent No. 6,480,727). Applicants respectfully disagree. Claims 7, 11 and 12 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In response, Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 8, 19 and 23.

Claim 1, as amended, teaches "adjusting an interval of time associated with a current user session for the application in proportion to the frequency of interaction with the application..."

*Sampson* does not disclose adjusting an interval of time associated with a current user session for the application in proportion to the frequency of interaction with the application. Therefore, *Sampson* does not anticipate or make obvious the invention as claimed in Claim 1.

Claim 8, as amended, teaches "associating each application with a separate priority value; employing each separate priority value to determine when to stop running each application on the small computing device during a period of inactivity; and employing a frequency of

Appl. No. 09/608,705  
Amdt dated 10/9/03  
Reply to Final Office Action of 7/29/03

interaction with a particular application to dynamically change the priority value associated with the particular application.”

*Sampson* does not disclose the limitations recited in Applicants' Claim 8. Specifically, *Sampson* does not disclose employing a frequency of interaction with a particular application to dynamically change a priority value associated with the particular application. Therefore, *Sampson* does not anticipate or make obvious the invention as claimed in Claim 8.

Claim 19, as amended, teaches “adjusting an interval of time associated with a current user session for the application in proportion to the frequency of interaction with the application” and “adjusting another interval of time associated with a current user session for the switch in proportion to the frequency of operation of the switch.”

*Sampson* does not disclose anything about adjusting an interval of time associated with a current user session. Therefore, *Sampson* does not anticipate or make obvious the invention as claimed in Claim 19. Claim 23, as amended, includes limitations similar to Claim 19. Thus, Claim 23 is submitted to be allowable for reasons analogous to those stated with regard to Claim 19.

Claims 24-28 have been added and are believed to be allowable because, as admitted in the Office Action, the prior art of record does not disclose the limitations of these claims. Specifically, *Sampson* does not disclose increasing the length of the interval of time when the frequency of interaction with the application (or the frequency of operation of the switch) is greater than a defined value. Nor does *Sampson* disclose decreasing the length of the interval of time when the frequency of interaction with the application (or the frequency of operation of the switch) is less than the defined value.

Claims 2-7 and 24 depend on Claim 1, and are submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons that Claim 1 is proposed to be allowable. Claims 9 and 12-16 are dependent on Claim 8, and are submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons that Claim 8 is proposed to be allowable. Claims 20-22, 25 and 26 depend on Claim 19, and are submitted to be

10-10-03 09:44 FROM-MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

206-342-6201

T-655 P.014/014 F-450

Appl. No. 09/608,705  
Amdt dated 10/9/03  
Reply to Final Office Action of 7/29/03

allowable for at least the same reasons that Claim 19 is proposed to be allowable. Claims 27 and 28 depend on Claim 23, and are submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons that Claim 23 is proposed to be allowable.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Claims 1-9, 12-16 and 19-28 are submitted to be allowable, and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Summary

It is respectfully submitted that each of the presently pending claims (Claims 1-9, 12-16, and 19-28) are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is requested. The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representative at the below-listed telephone number if it is believed that prosecution of this application may be assisted thereby. Although certain arguments regarding patentability are set forth herein, there may be other arguments and reasons why the claimed invention is patentably distinct. Applicants reserve the right to raise these arguments in the future.

Respectfully submitted,  
MERCHANT & GOULD

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.  
P.O. Box 2903, Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903  
206.342.6200

Customer No. 23552

By:   
Name: Timothy P. Sullivan  
Reg. No.: 47,981  
Tel. No.: 206.342.6254